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The Problem: Where We Are Today

- Inaccurate statistics on prevalence
  - Nationwide and context specific to college campuses
- Underreporting and/or lack of reporting
- Inconsistent definition of sexual assault
- Existing incentives for universities to underreport
- Cultural challenges
  - “Toxic masculinity”
  - Party culture, Greek life, normalization
Our North Star

We envision a future in which all genders have positive and fulfilling experiences within their educational institutions, free from sexual harassment and assault.

- **Occurrence accuracy**
  - Improve accountability when a report is made
- **Culture change**
  - Create strong, healthy relationships where boundaries and norms are supported and enforced within peer networks
- **Educational component**
  - Create a consistent definition of “sexual assault”
  - Dismantle myths about sexual assault and rape
- **Survivor support**
  - Prioritize victims’ safety; increase support services and protection
Traditional Policy Process: Where has it failed and why?

- Title IX (1972) and sexual violence: legal and cultural history
- 2011: “Dear Colleague Letter” (Obama administration)
  - Debate about ensuring victim protections and adequate due process
  - Lack of guidance; confusion for institutions; problem persists and survivors are left without appropriate supports in place
- 2017: Proposed Title IX revisions (Trump administration)
  - Obama-era policy reversals
Traditional Policy Process: Continued

● Most college sexual assault prevention programs are ineffective at reducing sexual violence
  ○ Programs aimed at knowledge/attitudes not sufficient
  ○ Single session (limited outcome changes) vs. longer programs
  ○ Single gender audience approaches more effective than mixed
  ○ Training programs can reinforce traditional gender beliefs

● Affirmative consent policies
  ○ Misguided policy process: the verdict is still out
Traditional Policy Process: Success Examples

- Changing Campus Culture Initiative (Ohio, 2015)
- “Safe Dates” (middle- and high-school students)
- “Shifting Boundaries” (middle school students)
- U.S. Violence Against Women Act (1994)
Key Stakeholders

- **Coalition building is critical**
  - University administrators, faculty, and board members
  - Nonprofit partners within local contexts
  - National fraternity and sorority umbrella organizations
  - Domestic violence advocacy groups
  - Student activists, survivors, and allies
  - Parents
  - Police
Social Innovation Process I: Needs Assessment

- Entire campus community to be involved in policy development process
- Three-pronged approach
  - Targeted Interviews
  - Mandatory Survey
  - Focus Groups
- Aggregating data in a consolidated final report
- Questions to consider: Do findings differ depending on the size of the institution? In urban vs. rural settings? Depending on the size of the Greek scene? In relation to the ratio of male/female students? Among others...
Social Innovation Process II: Design

- Utilizing a collective impact framework (five key conditions)
- Incorporate relevant nine principles of prevention to address:
  - Policy
  - Support
  - Communication
  - Operations
  - Partnerships
- Strategies should address multiple intervention components and effect multiple settings
Social Innovation Process III: Pilots

- Testing & continuous research phase utilizing lean experimentation
- Backbone support organization (SAFE) manages the pilots process
  - Small-scale experimentation: Organizing chapters (comprised of three institutions)
  - Provide organizations with:
    - Monthly training and support calls
    - Customized workshops to address institutional needs
    - Experts trained to assist with improved reporting and compliance standards
  - Communications component:
    - A/B testing
Social Innovation Process IV: Scaling/Diffusion

- Focus on **impact**: storytelling and data collection
- Outreach efforts through SAFE
  - Demonstrated success: other universities to adopt their own plans
  - Community organizing techniques: Showing up for Racial Justice
- KIPP example: framework for success that is adaptable to specific contexts
  - Our framework will emphasize 1) robust peer networks; 2) full-cycle communication and accountability; and 3) victim support
Key Metrics and Learning Objectives

- Increase in reporting (Year 1, Year 2, Year 3, etc…)
- Increase in survivor services
- Satisfaction with survivor services
- Reduction in communication pathway disconnects
- Survey measuring consistent definition of sexual assault
- Stronger peer networks among male students
  - Ex: increased ongoing bystander intervention trainings
Financing the Plan

- SAFE utilized to coordinate activities, facilitate data collection, and provide support to all partners
- Foundation (or High Net Worth Individuals) best suited to fill this role; will finance during pilot phase
  - Commitment to women’s rights, interest in sexual assault prevention
  - Poised for innovation (not beholden to taxpayers or donors)
  - Providing commitment up front; costs embedded within university structures over time
Conclusion: *Further Ideas to Explore*

- **Beneficial conditions for diffusion:**
  - Current political climate contributing to increase in action & dialogue
  - Institutional failure thus far to properly address the proliferation of sexual assaults on college campuses

- **Combination of techniques/models:**
  - Collective impact frameworks
  - Community organizing
  - Social movement building

- **Utilize learnings from successes and failures of traditional policy process to create a new social innovation process**
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